

**Remarks**

Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 4, 12, 13, 14, and 18 have been amended. Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out duplicative claim 20 which has now been canceled and the error of claim 18 which has now been amended to be dependent from claim 15. Applicants also amended claim 14 – support for the amendment may be found in paragraph [0070]. The Examiner objected to Claim 1 stating that formula (II) should contain a point of attachment, specifically formula (II) should read  $-(Y_{3-n}R_nSiO_{1/2})_c(Y_{2-o}R_oSiO_{2/2})_d$  .... As discussed with the Examiner, formula (II) is illustrating the types of carbon and silicon containing units an R<sup>4</sup> group may include. Formula (II) does not specify how any of these units are attached to each other if they are included, however a person skilled in the art would understand that they would need to be attached so there are the proper number of bonds. With respect to the R<sup>4</sup>'s group attachment to the Z group, the claim does specify that in formula (II) one of the Y groups is replaced by the Z group bonding the R<sup>4</sup> group to the cyclosiloxane of formula (I). The Examiner was also concerned that the carbon atom in the (CR<sub>q</sub>Y<sub>1-q</sub>) unit only has 3 bonds. As discussed above and with the Examiner, this unit would be bonded to 2 other units so that the carbon atom would have the mandatory four bonds.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 as being indefinite. Applicants have amended Claim 4 to state that x is an integer.... Support for this language can be found in claim 5. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 8-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nakayoshi (US2002/0099114). Claim 1 has been amended so that the catalyst useful in the method is a ring opening polymerization catalyst. Support for this amendment may be found in paragraph [0063]. Since Nakoyoshi et al does not teach using these type of catalysts, Nakayoshi et al does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 6, 8-11 and 13. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Page 10 of 11

The Examiner also provisionally rejected claims 1-6, and 9-11 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 and 8-13 of copending application No. 10/538,680. Applicants will submit a terminal disclaimer with respect to copending application No. 10/538,680.

For the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejections to claims 1-6 and 8-21 and allow the claims to issue.

Applicants would like to bring to the Examiner's attention the fact that office actions/rejections are also pending in copending US applications No. 10/512,750 and No. 10/538,680 and US application No. 10/512,953 has been allowed.

This reply is being submitted within the period for response to the outstanding office action. Although the applicants believe in good faith that no extensions of time are needed, the applicants hereby petition for any necessary extensions of time. You are authorized to charge deposit account 04-1520 for any fees necessary to maintain the pendency of this application. You are authorized to make any additional copies of this sheet needed to accomplish the purposes provided for herein and to charge any fee for such copies to deposit account 04-1520.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dow Corning Corporation



Patricia M. Scaduto  
Reg. No. 39,827  
Tel: 989-496-6925